

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17-18, 20, 22-23 and 26 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 7, 12, 14, 16, 19, 21, 24-25 and 27-30 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17-18, 20, 22-23 and 26 now are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6, 728,271 (“Kawamura”).

Kawamura discloses “a stream demultiplexing device for demultiplexing a transport stream superimposed on a broadcast wave into a plurality of elementary streams” (col.1, lines 9-12). Kawamura further discloses “*the order of dividing and storing the PES packets is determined based on time stamps attached to them, although this does not relate to the subject matter of the invention . . . [and] regardless of how many different elementary streams are time-division multiplexed in one transport stream, all PES packets of the elementary streams are equally divided and stored in payloads of transport packets in the transport stream before transmission*” (col. 7, lines 2-11; emphasis provided).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, recites “attaching a time stamp to each of the separated channel packets . . . comparing the time stamp of each channel packet to a ready time; and if the time stamp of a channel packet equals the ready time, transferring channel data from the channel packet and associated data from an associated packet to a player device” (emphasis provided). As an initial matter, Kawamura considers the *order*

of dividing and storing the packets based on time as irrelevant to its subject matter. To the extent time stamping is relevant, Kawamura's order of *dividing and storing based on time stamps* is not the same as attaching time stamps to the already separated channel packets and comparing the time stamp with the ready time to help determine the ripeness of the channel data and associated data for transfer to the player device as recited by claim 1. Kawamura does not teach or reasonably suggest the attaching the time stamp to the separated channel packets, comparing the time stamp to the ready time, and using the comparison results to determine when to transfer the channel data and associated data as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 11 and 18 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 18 and their dependent claims.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 05.05.05



Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980